

REMARKS

I. Introduction

These amendments and remarks are being filed in response to the Office Action dated February 16, 2007.

As discussed above on page 3 of this paper, the specification has been amended to clarify language and correct informalities. Support for these amendments is found for example in originally filed FIG. 8. The title has been amended to more clearly describe the subject matter.

Claims 1-14, and 17 have been amended. Claims 20-24 have been added. Support for the amendments to claims 1-4, 7, 12-14 and 17 is found at pages 8-10 paragraphs 28-32, page 22 paragraph 75, page 16 paragraph 59, pages 24-25 paragraphs 81-83 (corresponding to page 9 line 7 to page 10 lines 23, pages 26 line 18 to page 27 line 5, page 18 line 14 to page 19 line 8, and page 29 line 7 to page 30 line 13 of clean substitute specification). Claims 5, 6, and 8-11 have been amended to correct informalities.

As such new no matter has been added.

II. Election/Restrictions

Applicants elected claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 12-17 in the reply filed on 3/3/2006 following a restriction requirement.

III. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 3, 4, 7, 8 and 12-14 due to informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the claims obviate these objections. As such, Applicants request withdrawal of the objections.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter regarded as the invention. Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, claim 17 has been amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

V. Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-4, 7, 8 and 12-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Brown U.S. Patent 6,351,427, hereafter “Brown.” Applicants disagree with the rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution, the claims have been amended.

The instant device and method as recited in independent claims 1, 12 and 13, is clearly distinguishable from Brown.

Specifically, claims 1, 12 and 13 require a memory matrix architecture, in which access to memory storage units is fixed and directed rather than random (see FIG. 8). Furthermore, the claims require that the architecture of connections is organized to ensure that the temporal sequence of information is retained through storage of successive information bits in sequentially connected fixed memory storage units that are always written to and latched in the same ordered sequence. See original specification page 8, paragraphs 28-32 (corresponding cleans substitute specification page 9 line 7 to page 10 lines 23).

In contrast, Brown teaches a method for improving the speed and efficiency of a Random Access Memory (RAM) device by multiplexing and allowing simultaneous reading from and writing to memory storage units (termed “dynamic RAM”). Brown therefore merely teaches an improvement within the framework of conventional RAM organization.

Furthermore the present invention teaches subsequent reading of information (retrieval) stored in sequentially connected arrays of fixed memory storage units, which is accomplished in the same order of sequence so that the temporal order of the stored information is recreated, see page 21 paragraph 71 of original specification, (corresponding page 25, lines 5-11).

Moreover, the claims as amended require a plurality of sequentially connected arrays of fixed memory storage units that can be synchronized by signals generated over functionally perpendicular connections, such that fixed memory storage units representing the same point in time in multiple parallel sequentially connected arrays will write or read-out information simultaneously (see FIG. 8).

However, in the present invention as distinct from Brown, reading and writing are not done simultaneously from the same fixed memory storage units. Thus the present invention is faster and more efficient than devices which require central processing of multitudinous memory addresses to retain the temporal sequence of stored information.

Moreover, the present invention allows the recreation over time, of temporally sequential information that was applied simultaneously through multiple inputs, thereby generating a temporally dynamic recreation of the entirety of information stored.

Accordingly, Brown fails to anticipate the claims 1-4, 7, 8 and 12-17.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Application No.: 09/986,290

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Aamer S. Ahmed
Registration No. 58,958

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 ASA:MWE
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 15, 2007

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**